ANASTROPHE IN MANIL. 2.953

At the end of the long passage about the dodecat(r)opos Manilius considers the seventh house, the house of the descendant (2.953–4):

> *hinc etiam ipse dies moritur terrasque per orbem*
> *surripit et noctis captum sub carcere claudit*.

These verses have been misunderstood by all editors since Scaliger, because readers, induced by the frequent hexameter close *per orbem*,[1] took *per* with *orbem*. In 1995 I showed[2] that we have to assume an anastrophe,[3] *per* has to be taken with *terras*. The regular order would be: 'hinc[4] etiam dies ipse moritur et orbem per terras surripit et (orbem) sub carcere noctis captum claudit', which means: 'From here the very day(light) dies away, and it (the day, i.e. the daily rotation) steals the globe away across the lands and locks it up captive in the gaol of night'. The meaning of *dies* shifts from daylight to the daily rotation.

G. P. Goold, however, in his second Teubneriana, overlooked[5] this solution and maintained the text of Housman. In order to preserve the Manilian text from further alterations it seems opportune to repeat and to reinforce the arguments for the transmitted version.

What kind of *orbis* is thought of here? There are three possibilities: the globe of the earth, the globe of the heavens (its inside seen from the earth), or the globe of the sun. The globe of the earth is excluded if we accept *per terras*, because it would mean the same. The globe of the heavens and the globe of the sun execute the same apparent daily movement (the annual movement of the sun may be neglected here): it is the globe of the heavens that embraces and thus takes away the globe of the sun, and, together with the sun, the daylight. From the astronomical point of view there is no difference between the daily movement of the sun and that of the heavens.

For further clarification we have to consider the context: *dies* is the subject, and the day fades and conceals the globe. The daily rotation of the heavens makes the globe of the sun invisible. Van Wageningen interprets *orbem* as heaven. Liuzzi follows him

[1] Cf. M. Wacht, *Concordantia in Manilii Astronomica* (Hildesheim, 1990), 284.

[2] W. Hübner, *Die Dodekatropos des Manilius* (MANIL. 2,856–970) (Stuttgart 1995), 79–80, with the earlier bibliography.

[3] On anastrophe, see M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), 2, 215–16: monosyllabic prepositions are to be found as 'postpositions' later than disyllabic ones. In poetry it occurs as early as Ennius: O. Skutsch, 'Enniana II', *CQ* 42 (1948), 94–101 (reprinted in *Studia Enniana* [London, 1968], 30–45), especially 99–100. For Manilius, see A. Cramer, *De Manilii qui dicitur elocutione* (Diss., Straßburg, 1882), 44–7 'anastrophe praepositionum', but 45 'Interdum poeta praepositiones bisyllabas (numquam monosyllabas) post substantivum vel pronomen collocat' is to be corrected. A. E. Housman *ad* Manil. 1.245 has 'illud tamen memorabile est, quod ita interdum collocantur [sc. praepositiones] ut primo adspectu ad aliud nomen pertinere videantur . . .'. As for the anastrophe of *per* cf. H. v. Kamptz, *TLL* X.1.c. 1166,42–1167,16 s.v. *per*.

[4] For *hinc* instead of Bentley's *hic* cf. 2.794 *unde fugit mundus* and 2.828 *unde dies redit*, and 1.420 *hinc* (*hic* M). B. Rehm, *TLL* VI.3.c. 2791,77–9 s.v. *hinc*.

[5] Leipzig and Stuttgart, 1996. He overlooked another anastrophe (of *inter*) conjectured in this journal by P. E. Knox, 'Manilius 1,88', *CQ* 39 (1989), 564–5. Knox's *emendatio palmaris* is all the more convincing as it had been proposed at least twice before: first by Edward Sherburne, who compared nine parallel verses in Manilius (see M. D. Reeve, review of *Manilio, Il poema degli astri I*, ed. R. Scarcia, E. Flores, and S. Feraboli [Milano 1996], *Gnomon* 72 [2000], 20), and secondly by Jakob van Wageningen in an early study ('Ad Manilium', *Mnemosyne* 41 [1913], 195–6) and in his commentary (Amsterdam, 1921), 36, whereas in his edition (Leipzig, 1915) he hides it in the apparatus.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.1.313 Published online by Cambridge University Press

when she cites Bentley's opinion, approved by van Wageningen:[6] 'pertanto, aggiunge il van Wageningen, in questo luogo, *orbis* è nel senso di *caelum* a cui si riferisce il *captum* di v. 954'. But in what follows, when she presents her own opinion, she interprets *orbem* as the sun: 'A noi pare convincente l'argomentare del van Wageningen e riteni- amo che non vada dimenticato la metaforizzazione dei termini: il giorno che muore è il sole che tramonta e sottrae alla vista le terre e, nel tramontare, il sole è come se fosse fatto prigioniero e chiuso nel carcere della notte'. This interpretation shifts from *dies* as the sun ('il giorno che muore è il sole che tramonta') to *orbem* as the globe of the sun ('chiuso nel carcere della notte'). I think she is on the right track, although she continues to take *terras* with *surripit*: 'sottrae alla vista le terre'. It is more likely that the daily rotation conceals the globe of the sun (and not the globe of the heavens) from the view of mankind, so that it is caught in the darkness of the night. If we understand *orbem* as the globe of the sun, *per terras* should be translated as 'over the expanse of the earth', as in Virg. *Aen*. 4.522–3 *carpebant fessa soporem / corpora per terras*.[7]

The anastrophe is supported by a commonly accepted parallel in another technical passage (3.520–1):

> *sic annum mensesque suos natura diesque*
> *atque ipsas voluit numerari signa per horas,*

'Thus did nature wish year and months and days and even hours to be duly counted out through the signs . . .'[8] In this passage the two vexed accusatives (*signa per horas*) occur in the same position at the hexameter conclusion as in 2.953 *terrasque per orbem*.

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster W. HÜBNER
huebner@uni-muenster.de

[6] In her second edition (Galatina, 1991), 205 ad loc. relating to van Wageningen's commentary, 156: 'Orbis igitur h.l. est caelum . . .'

[7] I am grateful to M. D. Reeve for this parallel.

[8] Bentley in Housman (1916), 52 ad loc.: 'ordinem esse *voluit annum mensesque diesque atque horas numerari per signa* intellexit Bentleius', and already in the first volume Housman himself (1903), 22: 'cum *horas per signa* intellegi vellet'.

PETRONIUS AND THE *VIR MALUS*[1]

Early on in the *Satyrica*, Ascyltos and Encolpius come to a forum where the traders specialize in stolen goods (Petr. *Sat*. 12.1). They decide to try selling a very fine *pallium* which they have stolen. Two potential buyers approach, a countryman and a young woman. The man seems familiar to Encolpius, and turns out to be the same one who had found a very tatty *tunicula* belonging to him and Ascyltos. Sewn into this tatty *tunicula*, however, is some money which they are anxious to recover. They decide to try to buy the *tunicula* from the man so as to secure at small expense the much larger amount sewn into it. To finance this scheme they decide to lower the asking price for the fine *pallium* in the hope of a speedy sale; but after they display more of the *pallium* than they had hitherto, the woman takes hold of it and begins to lay claim, raising a cry of 'Stop thief!'. Not to be outdone, Ascyltos and Encolpius grasp and lay equally vociferous claim to the apparently worthless *tunicula* . . .

[1] I am very grateful to an anonymous referee for several suggestions as to how my arguments might be strengthened.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/51.1.313 Published online by Cambridge University Press